DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 795 SP 007 583

TITLE	Distinguished Cooperating Teacher Program.
INSTITUTION	Chicago State Univ., Ill.
PUB DATE	Nov 73
NOTE	29p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85
DESCRIPTORS	*Cooperating Teachers; *Inservice Teacher Education; Professional Training; Student Teacher Relationship; Student Teaching; *Teacher Supervision; Teacher Workshops; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Distinguished Achievement Awards Entry

ABSTRACT

The Distinguished Cooperating Teacher Program at Chicago State University was developed to train cooperating teachers to supervise student teachers. The program departs from traditional practice by changing the roles of the classroom teacher and the university field supervisor. The supervisor's role becomes that of coordinator while the teacher assumes the supervisory role. Cooperating teachers and their assigned teacher candidates participate in a pre-student teaching workshop which is based on an analysis of the unique, and sometimes stress-filled, relationship between the two team members. The workshop has as its aim to enhance communication and interpersonal perceptions in addition to providing opportunities to communicate about forthcoming classroom procedures and objectives. Monthly seminars allow for discussion of progress and problems during the student-teaching experience. This program has been found to provide a) superior supervision because the student-teacher ratio is one-to-one, b) more direct involvement of the public school in the teacher preparation effort, and c) financial savings for the university. (Related documents are SP 007 584 and SP 007 585.) (Author/DDO)

ED 088795

ABSTRACT/INFORMATION FORM - 1974 DAA PROGRAM

Name of Program Submitted: DISTINGUISHED COOPERATING TEACHER PROGRAM

Institution (complete name): Chicago State University

President: Milton B. Byrd

Campus Public Information Officer: William J. Connelly

Faculty Member Responsible for Program: William M. Young

Title of the Faculty Member: Dean of Education

Signature: William M. Young

Title: Dean of Education Date: 11/15/73

Abstract: SEE ATTACHED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 007 583

ED 083795

NEWSRELEASE

THE DISTINGUISHED COOPERATING TEACHER PROGRAM AT CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY

The Distinguished Cooperating Teacher Program at Chicago State University was developed to train cooperating teachers to supervise student teachers. The program provides for a meaningful cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship, objective ways of evaluating classroom experiences, effective classroom teaching modification, and effective pupil management behaviors. The program also provides for pre-service experiences that allow analysis of simulated and actual classroom situations.

The Distinguished Cooperating Teacher Program was devised by William M. Young, Dean of Education at Chicago State University. Program content was developed from conceptual work at the Mid-Continental Regional Educational Laboratory in Kansas City. Dr. Grant Clothier of Midwest Educational Training and Research Organization developed the program's basic training materials.

During August 1973, 60 selected teachers from public schools participated in a one-week training session at Chicago State University. Upon completion of the training, these teachers were appointed adjunct professors of education by Chicago State University. Student teachers who also underwent the training were assigned to these 60 teachers.

During the semester, these students worked with the teachers. At the end of the term, the Cooperating Teachers will assign grades and make final recommendations regarding the students. This entire process sharpley contrasts the standard student teaching process in which the University sends full-time faculty members to do the supervising. The standard type of supervision provides for approximately four visits to each student's classroom while the Distinguished Cooperating Teacher Program provides for constant observation and supervision by local school personnel with university supervision of adjunct professors only. This is possible because of the training received by the teachers during the intensified one-week session.

A program of this nature has many implications. They include: (1) a superior supervision process because the student-teacher ratio is reduced from a ratio of 1 to 15 to a ratio of 1 to 1; (2) more direct involvement of the public school in the teacher preparation effort; and (3) money-saving for the universities.

THE DISTINGUISHED COOPERATING TEACHER PROGRAM

CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY

The Problem

Student teaching is the only segment of the professional educational sequencc that is receiving universal acceptance and approval. Professors of academic disciplines and even the most severe critics of teacher education approve of student teaching because of its common sense and reasonableness. Students enthusiastically support the realism of actual classroom teaching and school personnel welcome the opportunity to share in the professional training of prospective teachers. However, despite such universal support there is considerable feeling that off-campus student teaching programs as presently structured lack some critical aspects needed to more fully prepare prospective teachers for the complex responsibilities of modern educational programs.

One of the critical weaknesses of student teaching programs expressed recently by the National Education Association[1] is the failure to effectively utilize input from the school and, in particular, from the cooperating teacher. Another weakness which has attracted considerable attention is the lack of formal response to attitudinal sets and interpersonal perceptions which affect interpersonal communication and transactions between cooperating teacher and teacher candidate. Only recently have corrective measures been taken to remedy this weakness. Faulty perceptions and

---

[1]Report of the Task Force on Practitioner Involvement. Presented to the 52nd Representative Assembly of National Education Association, 1973, Portland, Ore.

communication between these dyads can have adverse impact on pupil outcomes. Unless these weaknesses are corrected there is little reason to hope that traditional student teaching programs will achieve their full potential. The weaknesses are highlighted in inner-city schools where the relative failure of conventional approaches is most apparent. We do not imply that rectifying the weaknesses discussed above will solve education's problems. by recognizing the importance of effective communication and interaction, these parameters will improve significantly and will have a positive impact on teaching.

A national survey of 454 teacher education institutions conducted in 1971-72 by James Johnson revealed that nearly 60 percent of these institutions leave the selection of cooperating teachers entirely to someone in the cooperating school. Correspondingly, colleges appear to offer inadequate support to the cooperating teachers that are selected. Forty-three percent of the reporting institutions indicated that they rely on college supervisors to train cooperating teachers through conferences. An additional 37 percent offer some type of formal course dealing with supervision of student teachers; yet, less than 10 percent of the total number of cooperating teachers employed during the 1970-71 school year had enrolled in such courses. The evidence clearly points to a serious weakness in the preparation of cooperating teachers for supervision of teacher candidates.

The relationship between cooperating teachers and college supervisors is often vague and confusing. Is it the cooperating teacher or the student teacher who is being "supervised?" Can either party receive adequate

assistance considering the heavy supervisory load of a college supervisor? At Chicago State University the typical number of student teachers assigned to an advisor during a given term is 18. Occasionally the number of assigned students is 22 or 23. The University supervisor averages five site visits per trimester to each of his students. Is there any conceivable way a college supervisor can succeed in training the cooperating teacher while also supervising the assigned quota of students? Finally there is a paucity of evidence as to the effectiveness of university supervisors. In this period of declining budgets, some colleges and universities are questioning the value of such supervisory staffs. The cost of maintaining university supervisors is considered too high, particularly since there is so little evidence of their effectiveness.

Clearly consideration must be given to alternative procedures for improving professional training for prospective teachers, better utilization of professional staff and more efficient use of education dollars. These professional concerns and economic realities prompted Chicago State University to initiate an exciting concept, "The Distinguished Cooperating Teacher Program."

The Setting

Chicago State University is an institution in transition. Since 1967 it has undergone significant changes in response to a mandate to move from a single-purpose teachers college to a multi-purpose urban university. Black students now comprise about 70 percent of the student body, about five percent are Spanish-speaking and the remainder are White from various ethnic backgrounds.

The most visible change has been the University's move to a new campus with new facilities. For many years Chicago State University was housed on Chicago's south side in quarters that, at best, could be termed deplorable. In 1969 it was given the rare opportunity to plan, design and build a completely new campus. Working with community leaders, the University has constructed an outstanding educational plant equipped to provide a relevant academic program for its urban constituents.

Concurrent with the physical changes have come less visible, but even more significant, changes in educational perspectives. The administrative structure has been reorganized; new degree programs have been implemented; existing programs have been revised and expanded. In all of these activities the institution has been guided by a single statement of mission: "...to promote the educational achievement of undergraduates seeking the baccalaureate degree, preparing them for a life of work and participation in a democratic, urban society." Considering the University's strong teacher education tradition and its renewed sense of mission in an urban setting, its quest for innovation in teacher education is readily understood.

Description of the Program

Introduction

To enhance the interaction and communication between schools and colleges regarding the preparation of teachers, Chicago State University in cooperation with the Chicago Board of Education and the Chicago Teachers Union, has implemented the Distinguished Cooperating Teacher Program (D.C.T.P.). The program, which began in the Summer of 1973, is centered on the student teaching experiences of the teacher candidate. The program departs from traditional practice by changing the roles of the classroom teacher and the University field supervisor. The field supervisor's role changes from supervisor to coordinator while the teacher assumes the supervisor's role.

The format for role change is a pre-student teaching workshop conducted by University supervisors for teacher candidates and their prospective cooperating classroom teachers. The workshop institutes formal procedures developed by Grant Clothier for enhancing the communication and interpersonal perceptions between teacher candidate and cooperating classroom teacher.

A significant, but secondary, spin-off of the program in light of current fiscal restrictions on university budgets is the noticeably lower cost of the program as compared to the cost of standard student teacher supervision.

Distinguishing Features of the Program

Following are the more salient program features which distinguish DCTP from many conventional student teaching modes:

1. The cooperating teacher assumes major responsibility for supervision of the teacher candidate in the classroom, including determination of the candidate's course grade.

2. University personnel select the cooperating teachers.

3. University personnel serve as resource persons/counselors only at the request of either teacher candidates or cooperating teachers.

4. Cooperating teachers and their assigned teacher candidates participate in a pre-field experience workshop aimed at enhancing interpersonal communication and perception.

5. University course credit is given to both cooperating teachers and teacher candidates for particpation in the initial workshop.

6. Cooperating teachers are given University adjunct faculty status during the period in which they work with the teacher candidates.

7. Seminars occur periodically during the student experiences offering opportunities for progress and problem exchanges among participants.

8. The program saves the University a significant amount of money.

Program Components

The major components of the DCTP are: (1) Training of three University supervisors as workshop leaders. Training includes techniques for enhancing interpersonal communication and perception developed by Clothier and Kingsley.[2] (2) Recruitment of 60 distinguished cooperating teachers and 60 teacher candidates for the program. (3) Implementation of the workshop just prior to the student teaching field experience. (4) The field experience by dyads consisting of a teacher candidate and cooperating teacher which extends for one 16-week trimester. (5) Three half-day seminars for participants occuring monthly during the student's classroom experience. (6) Continual evaluation of the program.

Workshop Leader Training. Participants in the leader training program were volunteer University student teaching supervisors. Each of the three leaders was charged with selection and recruitment of 20 distinguished cooperating classroom teachers and 20 students who had met requirements preparatory to student teaching. Criteria for selection of the cooperating teachers was left to the individual University supervisors. Student selection was based on randomized procedures from a list of qualified student volunteers. Training consisted of three full-day sessions. Components of the leader training sessions included performing the interpersonal exercises led by Dr. Clothier; establishing formats and objectives

---

[2]Clothier, Grant and Kingsley, Elizabeth. Enriching Student Teaching Relationships, 1973. Midwest Educational Training and Research Organization. Shawnee Mission, Kansas.

for the teacher candidate/cooperating teacher workshops they would lead and establishing individual criteria for selection of cooperating teachers. The three leaders represented the areas of early childhood education (K-3), occupational education and secondary education.

Teacher/Student Recruitment. Cooperating teachers selected had at least three years of full-time classroom experience and had been recommended by the principals under whom they currently were working. In all cases, selection of cooperating teachers was based upon the University professor's firsthand knowledge of the teacher's classroom work through previous student teacher supervision contact. Recruitment of cooperating teachers by University supervisors was from a pool of cooperating teacher volunteers. Recruiting inducements beyond intrinsic interest in the program included the granting of three hours of academic credit (Seminar in Student Teaching Supervision) to cooperating teachers for participation in the pre-student teaching workshop and monetary remuneration for increased responsibilities assumed for supervision of teacher candidates during their time in the classroom. The traditional field experience arrangement offers cooperating teachers one tuition-free three-credit-hour scholarship for spending one trimester in the classroom with one teacher candidate. There is no pre-student teaching supervision course required of cooperating teachers participating in the conventional student teaching program. Such a course normally is not offered at the University.

As indicated above, teacher candidates for the program were recruited from respondents to information about the program which had been distributed

through University communication channels. Three hours of course credit (Independent Study) was granted for participation in the initial workshop to those students who were willing to pay tuition for the course. Approximately 80 percent of participating teacher candidates did register and receive credit for the experience. Approximately 100 students comprised the pool from which the 60 students were randomly selected as participants in the program.

Workshop

Workshop conceptualization was based on the analysis of the unique relationship between student and cooperating teacher. For the student, the abrupt change to near-professional status causes much stress. This feeling of stress is heightened by a number of factors: the experience of being closely supervised by another person in foreign territory; the awareness of a "generation gap" or the possibility of personality clashes; the knowledge that one is not a full-fledged teacher but must gain the cooperating teacher's approval before taking significant action; the difficulty in being honest and open with a cooperating teacher in whose hands one's professional future tenuously rests.

Similar anxieties are felt by the cooperating teacher: the necessity for sharing one's position of authority and prestige in the classroom; the insecurity of one's role in relation to the college supervisor and student teacher; the feeling of not being familiar with the latest educational theory and techniques; the uncertainty of college expectations regarding the training that is to be provided. These are but a few of the factors hindering effective interaction between student and cooperating teacher.

To overcome these inhibiting factors and provide leadership skills for the cooperating teacher, a training package was developed by the Midwest Educational Training and Research Organization. This product contains a series of competency-based activities designed to deal with four aspects of the team relationship. The following activities serve

as a core around which instructionsl strategies were designed:

1. THE SUPERVISING - TEACHING SITUATION: Expectations
   A look at conflicting and congruent expectations held by team members.

2. BEHAVIORS: Pinpointing Individual Action
   An examination of behaviors which inhibit or facilitate student teacher and cooperating teacher relationships.

3. PROBLEMS: A Method for Handling Situations
   A technique for the systematic resolution of problems which will inevitably arise.

4. CHANGE: Direction and Determining Factors
   The use of the Force-Field Analysis Model to reduce conflict by decreasing the restraining forces.

5. CONFERENCE: A Mutual Look at Relations
   A discussion of the contrasting conference styles with emphasis on the "Interactive Conference."

6. COMMUNICATION: Awareness of Complexity
   An attempt to foster open and honest communication using the Johari Window as a communication model.

7. FEEDBACK: An Observer Interpretation
   A simplified version of the Flanders Interaction Systems designed to provide an objective analysis of selected teaching behaviors.

8. A MODEL FOR INTERACTION: Plan, Act and Assess
   A synthesis of previous activities into a practical model to guide student-cooperating teacher behavior.

9. INTERACTION: Implementation of the Model
   The interaction model is tested and assessed in the classroom.

10. INTEGRATION: Development of Plan
    An opportunity is provided for team members to plan cooperatively a sequence of tentative experiences for the remainder of the student teaching term.

Obviously, the training series demands substantial interaction between the cooperating teacher and student teacher. The flow of training activities moves progressively from a relatively intellective "talking about" level of behavior toward a more action-oriented process analysis. It is assumed that:

1. Participant interaction will produce a great deal of "data" regarding both intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of supervisory relations, and

2. Training activities will facilitate understanding of the "data" generated in light of the substantive information possessed by those who participate in the activities.

Supporting this effort is the fact that the training activities follow a developmental, recycling format in which participants are provided:

1. cognitive inputs, structured practice and simulated experiences, less structured practice, and occasion for process analysis.

This cycle is repeated several times during the training with requisite competencies being emphasized and dealt with in an additive fashion.

Student Teaching Experience

In general the actual student teaching experience follows the general format established by the University. During the 16-week student teaching practicum, the teacher candidate is expected to spend each morning (8:30 a.m. to noon) in the school under the supervision of the cooperating teacher. As a result of the workshop experience, however, the interaction process between members of each dyad was substantially changed. This is due to greater understanding of and agreement on expectations and goals of the teaching experience as well as greater agreement on perceptions, expectations and values of participants' roles in the teaching situation.

Seminar for Participants

Three seminars were offered to participants of the program during each trimester. Seminars, held on the first Saturday of each month during a given trimester, lasted approximately three hours. The first hour was given to completion of evaluation materials, the second hour provided for small groups of teachers and candidates to discuss specific concerns which arose during the student teaching experience and the last hour was devoted to discussion of a given topic by the entire group. The small groups consisted of five teacher candidates and five cooperating teachers none of whom worked with one another in the schools.

Activities in Subsequent Trimesters

The program is intended to continue through succeeding trimesters. However, because cooperating teachers will continue with the program beyond the first trimester, certain modifications in program format

are needed. There will be no need to recruit cooperating teachers beyond those incurred through normal attrition. The most significant modification will occur in the workshop process. Because cooperating teachers will have experienced the workshop prior to the first trimester student teaching experience they will not have to experience again. Instead, prior to the first week of each succeeding trimester, on being assigned a new teacher candidate, the cooperating teacher will be responsible for initiating all of the competency-based activities designed by Clothier to deal with the team relationship. Supervision of dyad activities will again be the responsibility of University personnel.

Subsequent seminars will take place during each trimester as discussed above.

Evaluation

Evaluation focused on two major components of the program. One concern was to ascertain whether or not the workshop had a measurable impact on the interpersonal perceptions of one another by each of the cooperating teacher - teacher candidate pairs. Since a primary purpose of the workshop was to help break down feelings of distance, defensiveness and discomfort that frequently are reported by both teacher candidates and cooperating teachers in conventional teacher training situations, evaluation of the effectiveness of the workshop toward these ends was sought. The second evaluation focus was on the positive or negative attitudes of student and cooperating teachers toward the DCTP after they had worked together in the classroom for some time.

A third segment of the evaluation effort, which was of secondary importance, dealt with changes in attitude toward basic educational values on the part of workshop participants. Since the workshop concept was not oriented toward changes in attitudes regarding basic educational values, examination of these variables was primarily to obtain additional descriptions of participant characteristics. Cost estimates comparing the two programs also were made.

Evaluation Instruments

The instrument used to measure degree of agreement regarding perceptions of self and other was a modification of an instrument developed by R. D. Laing[3] called the Interpersonal Perception Method (IPM). The

---

[3]Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H. and Lee, A. R. Interpersonal Perception Method (IPM), New York: Springer, 1966.

instrument was completed independently by both participants of a given dyad. The instrument as modified consisted of 10 concepts each of which had to be responded to at three different levels of interpersonal perception. Each level in turn consisted of four questions. (See Appendix for copy of instrument).

The 10 concepts used were: (1) ability to listen, (2) understand feelings, (3) seriousness of relationship, (4) respect, (5) expectations, (6) interpersonal honesty, (7) freedom to be one's self, (8) creation of interpersonal difficulties, (9) fear and (10) responsibility.

The three levels for which responses were called under each concept were: (1) "How true do you think the following are?" (2) "How would he/she answer the following?" (3) "How would he/she think you have answered the following?" The instruments thus assess how each person in a dyad perceived the "accuracy" or "truth" of a concept, their perception of the other's perception and their perception of the other's perception of them.

Scoring of the instrument was determined by the degree of agreement among the members of each dyad at each level for each concept. Complete agreement between the members of the dyad for all four questions at any one level resulted in a score of four. Complete disagreement for all four questions at any one level yielded a score of zero.

Data on reliability and validity of the above instrument are reported in sketchy fashion in the Laing reference cited earlier. Test-retest reliability obtained in this study are presented in the results section below.

To obtain estimates of participants' attitudes toward the program after having experienced some of it, a questionnaire, which is contained in the Appendix, was developed.

Educational values were obtained through the VAL-ED instrument of the FIRO Scales developed by Schutz.[4] The VAL-ED instrument consists of 14 scales of which the following six were used: (1) Importance (IMP): "Education has intrinsic value beyond its occupational advantages." (2) Mind (Mind): "The School should concern itself primarily with developing the mind of the student rather than with developing his whole personality." (3) School-Child: Control (SC:C): "The School should help the child to realize and use his own abilities and judgment most effectively." (4) Teacher-Child: Control TC:C) "The teacher should regulate completely classroom lessons and activities." (5) Teacher-Child: Affection (TC:A): "The teacher should be personally friendly and warm toward the children." (6) Teacher-Community: Inclusion (TCm:I): "The teacher should participate in community activities and be encouraged to do so by community members."

Data and discussion of scoring, reliability and validity of VAL-ED are discussed in the manual indicated above.

An essay indicating reaction to the workshop was written by participants during the final hour of the workshop.

The sentence completion task developed by Loevinger[5] for her model of ego development also was administered to participants at the beginning

---

[4]Schutz, William C. The FIRO Scales. Palo Alto, CA., Consulting Psychologists Press, 1967.

[5]Loevinger, Jane; Wessler, Ruth; Redmore, Carolyn, Measuring Ego Development, 1970, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

of the pre-student teaching workshop. The instrument was used for research purposes only and will not be discussed in this paper.

Procedure

All of the instruments discussed above were administered to the 120 participants during the first hour of the workshop. The IPM and VAL-ED tasks were again administered to participants during the last hour of the last workshop session five days later. The IPM and the questionnaire were administered during the first hour of the first seminar held on October 6, 1973. Teacher candidates had at that time completed five weeks of work in the classroom with their cooperating teachers under the conditions of the program, i.e., having no contact with University personnel.

At the time statistical analyses were undertaken three repeated measures for the IPM, two measures of VAL-ED, and one set of data for the remaining instruments were available. The number of persons for whom data was available varied below 60 due to individual absences at various times.

Results

Analysis of the three sets of data for the IPM (pre-workshop, postworkshop and after five weeks of classroom experience) used the single-factor repeated measures design described by Winer.[6] Results are shown in Table 1.

---

[6]Winer, B. J., Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. (Second Edition). New York, McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Table 1

Analysis of Scores of Three Repeated Administrations

of the Interpersonal Perception Method to 50*

Pairs of DCTP Participants

Source	SS	df	MS	F	F.99
Between Dyads	3866	49			
Within Dyads	18,815	100			
Between Meas.	2,105	2	1,052.5	6.17	4.84
Residual	16,710	98	170.5		

*Number of dyads was reduced from 60 to 50 due to the absence of a few individuals during one or more of the testing sessions.

The results shown in Table above indicated significant differences among time sequence comparisons. To test for significant differences among individual pairs of means the Newman-Keuls test as described by Winer (see above) was used. Results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Tests on Ordered Pairs of

Means

	Preworkshop	After five wks. Class Work	Postworkshop
Preworkshop	———	359**	427**
After Five Wks.			68
**Significant beyond .99 level of confidence.			
Mean	100.04	107.22	108.58

The results shown in Table 2 indicate that there were statistically significant differences between the preworkshop mean and the means for both the postworkshop measure and the measure obtained after five weeks in the classrooms. No statistically significant difference was obtained between the means of the latter two measures. It was concluded that the workshop had a significant positive impact toward greater agreement in interpersonal perception among the pairs of persons in the program.

The lack of significant difference between the means of postworkshop scores and scores obtained approximately seven weeks later provides indirect evidence of the test-retest reliability of the IPM instrument. Although there was a tendency toward less agreement in interpersonal perceptions among the pairs after five weeks in the classroom compared with the degree of agreement at the end of the workshop the difference must

be attributed to chance variation. Test-retest reliability was also indirectly assessed when a control group of 20 students and their cooperating teachers enrolled in a conventional student teaching program at Chicago State University. They were administered the IPM on the first day of their student teaching experience and again one week later. The results indicated no significant differences in mean scores between the two administrations. Furthermore, there were no significant differences between either of the control group means and the mean score obtained on preworkshop for the pairs in the DCTP.

To explore for possible shifts in educational values as measured by the VAL-ED scales, separate analyses of each of the six scales listed above were performed using a multifactor repeat measurement design also described by Winer. The analyses sought mean differences in values between teacher candidates and cooperating teachers; shifts in scale values among both groups as a result of workshop participation; preworkshop and postworkshop comparisons; possible significant interactions between group identification, e.g., student teachers, and value shifts as a result of the workshop experience. Of the six analyses performed, significant differences were found in only one scale, the Teacher-Child: Affection scale, which measured the extent to which the teacher should be personally friendly and warm toward the children. A significant difference was found in that the student teachers held the value as stated above to a greater extent than the cooperating teachers. The

workshop had no significant effect in inducing meaningful shifts in the educational values of either the student teachers or cooperating teachers.

The percent of participants who preferred the program to a regular student teaching experience also was obtained from questionnaire data after participants had worked in the classroom together for five weeks. Results indicated that 78 percent of cooperating teachers and 91 percent of teacher candidates preferred the DCTP over the conventional program. There was no significant difference in the proportion responding favorably between the two groups ($\bar{z} = 1.30$, $\bar{z}_{.95} = 2.00$). Seven percent of both groups preferred the conventional program and approximately six percent of the total group did not respond to the question.

Responses regarding strengths and weaknesses of the program were varied and too complex to report. However, approximately 80 percent of the comments were favorable.

Summarizing the evaluation we found that the workshop had a significant impact on achieving agreement in interpersonal perceptions among the participants, and that a substantial majority preferred the program over a conventional approach. The workshop did not have a significant effect on shifting educational values among participants. This last result was not unexpected since the program was not oriented to achieving such shifts.

Regular program costs were for three University supervisors who would normally serve 162 students during the same period of time. The basic cost, not considering overhead, for the DCTP was $36,750 compared to $55,620 for the regular program. DCTP served 180 students over three trimesters.

Budget breakdown for the DCTP is shown below under the section on budget. The regular student teaching costs were based on the following breakdown: University supervisors' salaries - $54,000 for three supervisors at $18,000 per supervisor for three trimesters. Travel expenses for three supervisors over three trimesters - $1,305. No travel expenses were incurred in the DCTP. Supplies or University room-use expenses were not included in estimating regular program costs.

Based upon these figures (actual costs through the first trimester 1973-74 and estimated costs for the remaining two trimesters) the DCTP resulted in a savings of 36 percent compared over regular program costs. The cost per student in the DCTP was $204.16 compared to $343.33 per student in the regular student teaching program. The resultant savings in per student cost under the DCTP was 41 percent. The cost of $204.16 will be less in the second year of the program and the resultant savings will be about 50 percent.

Based on the various evaluation results we conclude that the DCTP does contribute toward meeting the objectives stated above and, in addition, makes a significant contribution toward the enhancement of

the educational process in terms of these objectives.

Objectives

1. To establish a format for the student teaching experience which will provide greater input from schools in the preparation of teacher candidates by redefining the cooperating teacher's role to give greater responsibility for supervision of the student teacher than is currently the case.

2. To provide formal opportunities for enhancing interpersonal communication through the development of greater agreement and understanding between co-workers in terms of their perceptions of themselves and of each other.

3. To establish agreed upon classroom process and outcome objectives between each student teacher-cooperating teacher pair prior to or at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

4. To enhance, through a systematic training program, the effectiness of cooperating teachers regarding student teacher supervision.

5. To reduce teacher preparation costs by redefining the role of University supervisors and by reallocating funds.

Personnel

DR. WILLIAM M. YOUNG, Dean of Education, Chicago State University and developer of the Distinguished Cooperating Teacher Program Model.

DR. GRANT CLOTHIER, Director of the Midwest Educational Training and Research Organization (METRO) and developer of the training materials for the Distinguished Cooperating Teacher Program. Director of the workshop leader training phase at Chicago State University.

DR. JAMES Z. CHRONES, Director, Field Services Section, Office of Educational Research, Development and Field Services. Associate Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Chicago State University. DCTP Project Coordinator.

MS. JUNE COOK, University supervisor, secondary education, Assistant Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Chicago State University. DCTP workshop leader and University coordinator.

DR. BARBARA KUCZEN, University supervisor, Early Childhood Education. Assistant Professor, Department of Early Childhood Education, Chicago State University. DCTP workshop leader and University coordinator.

DR. NORMAN LAWS, Chairman, Department of Occupational Education. Associate Professor, Department of Occupational Education, Chicago State University. DCTP workshop leader and University coordinator.

DR. STANLEY STARKMAN, Director, Office of Educational Research, Development and Field Services. Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Chicago State University. DCTP principal evaluator.

MR. ROBERT WOODS, Student research assistant, Evaluation Section, Office of Educational Research, Development and Field Services, Chicago State University. DCTP research assistant.

BUDGET SUMMARY

(1973-1974)

AUGUST

60 Distinguished Cooperating Teachers for Training Institute (plus free tuition courses for both Distinguished Cooperating Teachers and student teachers) at $100 per Distinguished Cooperating Teacher	$6,000
3 Members of Chicago State University faculty, participants in August Institute	2,150
3 Instructors of McRel Organization, trainers of Chicago State University faculty members @ $333.33	1,000
McRel Materials	600

SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER

60 Distinguished Cooperating Teachers @ $150 ea.	9,000

JANUARY-APRIL

60 Distinguished Cooperating Teachers @ $150 ea.	9,000

MAY-JUNE

60 Distinguished Cooperating Teachers @ $150 ea.	9,000
GRAND TOTAL	$36,150